



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/722,013

11/25/2003

Jiong-Ping Lu

TI 35669

6979

23494 7590 10/30/2008  
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED  
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999  
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

ERDEM, FAZLI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2826

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/722,013	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FAZLI ERDEM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2826	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/1/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7-10 and 12-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9, 10 and 12-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7, 8, and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/1/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the claim language "recrystallized polysilicon" is not a product by process limitation. However, examiner is still in the opinion that the claim language "recrystallized polysilicon" is a product by process limitation as explained in the rejection below. According to MPEP Section 2113:

"The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of *prima facie* obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. *In re Fessmann*, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, **the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product.**"

Applicant presents arguments as to the structural difference between a "as-deposited polysilicon" and "recrystallized polysilicon". However, the arguments do not constitute "evidence".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jung (6,204,105).

Regarding Claim 2, in Fig. 21 Jung discloses a semiconductor device, comprising: a first polysilicon layer 24b located over a gate electrode layer 34; and a capacitor located 34/29/34 on said first polysilicon layer 24b over said gate electrode layer 34, said capacitor, including; a first electrode 34; an insulator 29 located over said first electrode; and a second electrode 34 located over said insulator, wherein said first electrode 34 comprises a silicide.

Applicants assure us at page 7 of the remarks filed 10/8/07 that the single word “recrystallized,” (which Applicants repeat 15 times in their claims) is simply a shorthand for “formed by depositing an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same.” Therefore, it is reasonable to say that Applicant’s claims 2 and 3 do not distinguish over the Jung reference regardless of the process used to form first polysilicon layer 24b, because only the final product is relevant, not

Art Unit: 2826

the recited process of depositing said layer as an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same. See *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir, 2006 (“While the process set forth in the product-by-process claim may be new, that novelty can only be captured by obtaining a process claim.”))

The Federal Circuit recently revisited the question of whether a “product by process” claim can be anticipated by a reference that does not recite said process. *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d at 1100. The Federal Circuit cited with approval this Office’s current statement of the law, found in MPEP § 2113:

[Even] though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.

*Id.* at 1101. The Federal Circuit held this statement to be consistent with its own views on this topic, as well as various Supreme Court rulings, notably *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Wabash Appliance Corp.*, 304 U.S. 364, 373 (1938) (“Although in some instances a claim may validly describe a new product with some reference to the method of production, a patentee who does not distinguish his product from what is old except by reference, express or constructive, to the process by which he produced it, cannot secure a monopoly on the product by whatever means produced.”). *Id.*

Note that when “product by process” claiming is used to describe one or more limitations of a claimed product, the limitations so described are limitations of the claimed product per se, no matter how said product is actually made. In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this

Art Unit: 2826

issue); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. See also MPEP 706.03(e).

Regarding Claim 3, in Fig. 2l, Jung’s first electrode 34 comprises cobalt silicide.

3. Claims 7, 8 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amo et al. (2004/0129963)

Regarding Claims 7 and 8, in Figs. 2a and 2b, Amo et al. disclose a semiconductor device, comprising: a first polysilicon layer 208 located over a gate electrode layer 204; and a capacitor located on said first polysilicon layer 208, said capacitor, including; a first electrode 210; an insulator located 211 over said first electrode; and a second electrode 212 located over said insulator; wherein said gate electrode layer 204 is a second polysilicon layer and said first polysilicon layer 208 is located directly on said second polysilicon layer.

Applicants assure us at page 7 of the remarks filed 10/8/07 that the single word “recrystallized,” is simply a shorthand for “formed by depositing an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same.” Therefore, it is reasonable to say that Applicant’s Claims 7 and 8 does not distinguish over the Amo et al. reference regardless of the process used to form first polysilicon layer 208, because only the final product is relevant, not the recited process of depositing said layer as an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same. See *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*,

Art Unit: 2826

78 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir, 2006 (“While the process set forth in the product-by-process claim may be new, that novelty can only be captured by obtaining a process claim.”))

The Federal Circuit recently revisited the question of whether a “product by process” claim can be anticipated by a reference that does not recite said process. *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v.*

*Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d at 1100. The Federal Circuit cited with approval this Office’s current statement of the law, found in MPEP § 2113:

[Even] though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.

*Id.* at 1101. The Federal Circuit held this statement to be consistent with its own views on this topic, as well as various Supreme Court rulings, notably *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Wabash Appliance Corp.*, 304 U.S. 364, 373 (1938) (“Although in some instances a claim may validly describe a new product with some reference to the method of production, a patentee who does not distinguish his product from what is old except by reference, express or constructive, to the process by which he produced it, cannot secure a monopoly on the product by whatever means produced.”). *Id.*

Note that when “product by process” claiming is used to describe one or more limitations of a claimed product, the limitations so described are limitations of the claimed product per se, no matter how said product is actually made. *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process”

Art Unit: 2826

claim and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. See also MPEP 706.03(e).

Regarding Claim 8, Figs. 2a and 2b show that in Amo et al.’s semiconductor device polysilicon layer 208 forms at least a portion of a gate electrode stack

Regarding Claims 19-21, in Figs 2A and 12-16, Amo et al. disclose, transistors 204 located over a substrate 201, wherein at least one of said transistors includes a gate electrode stack comprising a polysilicon 208 layer located over a gate electrode layer 204; a capacitor located on said polysilicon layer, said capacitor including; a first electrode 210; an insulator 211 located over said first electrode; and a second electrode 212 located over said insulator; and an interlevel dielectric 207/209 layer located over said substrate, said interlevel dielectric layer having interconnects 1213 in Figs 12 and 13 and also in Fig. 11 located therein for contacting at least one of said gate electrode stack or said capacitor.

Applicant’s Claims 19-21 do not distinguish over the Amo et al. reference regardless of the process used to form first polysilicon layer 208, because only the final product is relevant, not the recited process of depositing said layer as an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same. See *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir, 2006 (“While the process set forth in the product-by-process claim may be new, that novelty can only be captured by obtaining a process claim.”))

The Federal Circuit recently revisited the question of whether a “product by process” claim can be anticipated by a reference that does not recite said process. *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v.*



Art Unit: 2826

*Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d at 1100. The Federal Circuit cited with approval this Office's current statement of the law, found in MPEP § 2113:

[Even] though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.

*Id.* at 1101. The Federal Circuit held this statement to be consistent with its own views on this topic, as well as various Supreme Court rulings, notably *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Wabash Appliance Corp.*, 304 U.S. 364, 373 (1938) (“Although in some instances a claim may validly describe a new product with some reference to the method of production, a patentee who does not distinguish his product from what is old except by reference, express or constructive, to the process by which he produced it, cannot secure a monopoly on the product by whatever means produced.”). *Id.*

Note that when “product by process” claiming is used to describe one or more limitations of a claimed product, the limitations so described are limitations of the claimed product per se, no matter how said product is actually made. *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. See also MPEP 706.03(e).

Art Unit: 2826

Regarding Claim 20, at least a portion of Amo et al.'s first polysilicon layer 208 forms a portion of said first electrode 204.

Regarding Claim 21, Amo et al.'s transistors 204 are CMOS transistors.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung (6,204,105) in view of Takemura (6,218,233).

Jung discloses a semiconductor device having all the limitations of claim 4 except the limitation of a surface roughness of 1-2 nm. However, Takemura discloses a semiconductor device where in Figs. 8-13, the required surface roughness is disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the required surface roughness in Jung as taught by Takemura in order to have a capacitor structure with increased performance.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung (6,204,105) in view of Tu (6,642,097).

In Fig. 21, Jung discloses a semiconductor device, comprising: a first polysilicon layer 24a/24b located over a gate electrode layer 34; and a capacitor located on said first polysilicon layer, said capacitor, including; first electrode 30a; an insulator located over said first electrode; and a

Art Unit: 2826

second electrode located over said insulator 29; wherein at least a portion of said first polysilicon layer 24b forms a portion of said first electrode.

Applicants assure us at page 7 of the remarks filed 10/8/07 that the single word “recrystallized,” is simply a shorthand for “formed by depositing an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same.” Therefore, it is reasonable to say that Applicant’s claims 2 and 3 do not distinguish over the Jung reference regardless of the process used to form first polysilicon layer 24b, because only the final product is relevant, not the recited process of depositing said layer as an amorphous layer and recrystallizing the same. See *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir, 2006 (“While the process set forth in the product-by-process claim may be new, that novelty can only be captured by obtaining a process claim.”))

The Federal Circuit recently revisited the question of whether a “product by process” claim can be anticipated by a reference that does not recite said process. *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 78 USPQ2d at 1100. The Federal Circuit cited with approval this Office’s current statement of the law, found in MPEP § 2113:

[Even] though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.

Id. at 1101. The Federal Circuit held this statement to be consistent with its own views on this topic, as well as various Supreme Court rulings, notably *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Wabash Appliance Corp.*, 304 U.S. 364, 373 (1938) (“Although in some instances a claim may validly describe a new product with some reference to the method of production, a patentee who does not distinguish his product from what is old except by reference, express or constructive, to the

Art Unit: 2826

process by which he produced it, cannot secure a monopoly on the product by whatever means produced.”). *Id.*

Note that when “product by process” claiming is used to describe one or more limitations of a claimed product, the limitations so described are limitations of the claimed product per se, no matter how said product is actually made. *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. See also MPEP 706.03(e).

Jung fails to disclose the required final thickness for the polysilicon layer. However, Tu discloses a capacitor structure where in Fig. 1, polysilicon layer 32 has a thickness of around 30 nm.

It would have been obvious to one of having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the required thickness for the polysilicon layer in Jung as taught by Tu, in order to have a semiconductor device with smaller geometry.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAZLI ERDEM whose telephone number is (571)272-1914. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached on (571) 272-1236. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FE

October 21, 2008

/Sue A Purvis/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2826